

REMARKS

The specification has been amended in a cosmetic manner, and the independent claims have been amended to avoid the cited references.

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under § 102 on the basis of Hasegawa et al. '889. Applicants traverse this rejection because Hasegawa et al. '889 do not disclose (or suggest) applying an offset when an image is displayed.

The present invention prevents decrease of contrast ratio caused by the incomplete memory effect. The decrease is prevented by the use of driving signals which are positively or negatively offset with respect to a reference voltage of the panel, as shown in Figs. 4D1-4D6, which show potentials appearing across each picture element. Figs. 4D1-4D6 show signals applied to drive each picture element. In other words, offset signals are applied to the picture elements for making the image.

Considering in detail the cited part of Hasegawa '889, col. 14, lines 50-60, col. 20, lines 30-45, are directed to a method in which two regions in a single pixel have different smectic layer directions (col. 14, lines 16-21, col. 2, lines 51-54). To make these regions, offset voltages are applied to each region respectively.

Thus, the offset voltage in Hasegawa '889 is applied to a liquid crystal material during manufacturing a display, not during an image being displayed. For this reason, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under § 102 on the basis of Kondoh. Applicants traverse this rejection because Kondoh does not disclose (or suggest) switching data signals by TFTs, as in the present invention.

The present invention uses TFTs as switching devices, as shown in Figs. 3C and 9B, while in Kondoh the description in paragraph 0010 and the matrix electrodes for driving in Fig. 5 do not anticipate a switching device to switch a voltage to be applied across the pixel. Thus, the rejection based on Kondoh has been avoided by amending claim 1 to recite that the data signals are switched by TFTs.

Claims 3-6 and 8-16 stand rejected under § 103 on the basis of Hasegawa '889 and Hasegawa '887. Claims 9, 10 and 12 also stand rejected on the basis of Hasegawa '889 and Hasegawa '717, and claim 7 stands rejected on the basis of those and other references. Applicants respectfully traverse all of these rejections because none of the references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest providing an offset when an image is displayed, as in the independent claims of the present invention as amended.

The element of claim 3 cited in lines 10-14 in item 7 of the office action depend on the same part, col. 14, lines 50-57, and col. 18, lines 40-43 in Hasegawa 889, for the rejection of claim 1. Thus, the previous discussion about Hasegawa '889 is valid, because the description in col. 10, lines 60-67 is directed to the alignment treatment condition, as described in col. 10, lines 1-4. For this reason, the amended claims are allowable over the cited references, because the present invention provides an offset when an image is displayed.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Patrick G. Burns

Registration No. 29,367

May 20, 2003

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315
F:\Data\WP60\0671\65390\Amend A.doc